

OLL 85-3291/5
19 November 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: "Diplomatic Security" Hearing Before the
Subcommittee on International Operations of
the House Foreign Affairs Committee

1. Chairman Mica of the Subcommittee on International Operations called for a hearing on Diplomatic Security on November 13, 1985. In his opening statement Chairman Mica criticized the Administration for its failure to give the Subcommittee a legislative package derived from the recommendations of the Inman Report - Secretary's Advisory Panel on Overseas Security. Congresswoman Snowe, the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee, joined in the Chairman's admonition. She said that peoples' lives were at stake in all U.S. missions abroad and that the Administration was irresponsible by its lack of promptness in this matter.

2. Another observation by Mica was that the Inman Report was to be a consensus document. Theoretically, if all agreed to the legislative recommendations made by the Report, then the bill would move swiftly through the House and Senate. For this reason he and many other members refrained from introducing their own bill to protect U.S. missions abroad. Because more than four months have passed since the promulgation of the Inman Report and the Administration has yet to provide a bill, there is little or no chance for Congress to act during this session. At this point Chairman Mica became furious because he was told back in July that all concerned were working on the legislative package and a submission would soon be provided.

3. Chairman Mica then said he would retaliate against any department or agency that held up the bill because of a "turf battle." He would "make them pay."

4. Under Secretary of State Ronald Spiers, testifying for the Administration, expressed great concern about the budget and debt implications of the draft bill. Authorization for four billion dollars (\$4,000,000,000) at a time that the Congress is discussing the Gramm-Rudmann proposal seemed inconsistent. Except for budget matters, the Administration was strongly supportive of the draft bill.

5. Associate Director of USIA, Mr. Kingman, testified that he was in agreement with the testimony of the Under Secretary of State. However, Kingman noted that if all of the money was spent on Embassy security, nothing would be available for buildings which house USIA or AID facilities. Terrorists would merely shift their activities to the softer target. Residences outside the embassy compound would also be more vulnerable. The testimony of the Deputy Administrator of AID reiterated that of the USIA.

6. Chairman Mica then focused on a document called a "Statement of Principles and Clarification of Responsibilities." Apparently, it was the intention of State to use this memo of understanding among the agencies affected by the bill to achieve agreement before submitting the draft bill to Congress. As a matter of good faith the agencies that signed onto the agreement would not approach the Committee independently once the bill was submitted. Both USIA and AID initially testified that they were in substantial agreement. When questioned by Committee members these agencies admitted major differences with State.

7. Perhaps the best way to summarize the outcome of the hearing is to say that everyone agreed with the lofty goals of diplomatic security but there was a wide difference of opinion on how to implement that goal.

STAT

DC/LD/OLL